1 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

| GARY TOPOLEWSKI, et al., Plaintiff(s), |) Case No. 2:16-cv-01588-JAD-NJK) |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| VS. | ORDER |
| PAULA BLYSCHAK, et al., | (Docket Nos. 30, 31) |
| Defendant(s). |))) |

Pending before the Court are a proposed discovery plan and a stipulation to delay initial disclosures. Docket Nos. 30, 31. The parties seek to stay their discovery obligations pending resolution of certain pending motions. *See* Docket No. 30 at 2-3; Docket No. 31 at 2-3. The pendency of a dispositive motion, standing alone, is not grounds for parties to delay their discovery obligations. "The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide for automatic or blanket stays of discovery when a potentially dispositive motion is pending." *Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013) (quoting *Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 601 (D. Nev. 2011)). Instead, such a delay in discovery requires a showing that the relevant standards have been satisfied. *See, e.g., Kor Media*, 294 F.R.D. at 581 (outlining standards). In this case, those standards have not been addressed.

Accordingly, the proposed discovery plan and stipulation to delay initial disclosures are **DENIED** without prejudice. A further proposed discovery plan shall be submitted by no later than September 30, 2016. To the extent a delay is sought pending resolution of any motion, the proper

Case 2:16-cv-01588-JAD-NJK Document 32 Filed 09/26/16 Page 2 of 2

standards must be addressed. Otherwise, the proposed discovery plan shall omit any reference to delaying discovery on that basis. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: September 23, 2016 NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge